UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

Case No. 20-CR-048-WMC

GERARDO JUNIOR TORRES,

Madison, Wisconsin February 17, 2021

Defendant.

1:08 p.m.

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE SENTENCING HEARING

HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM M. CONLEY

## APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Office of the United States Attorney BY: ELIZABETH ALTMAN Assistant United States Attorney 222 West Washington Avenue, Suite 700 Madison, Wisconsin 53703

For the Defendant:

Federal Defender Services of Wisconsin, Inc. BY: KELLY A. WELSH Madison Branch Office 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 1000 Madison, Wisconsin 53703

## Also Present:

Gerardo Junior Torres, Defendant Mariah Stieve, U.S. Probation Officer Andrea Erickson, Victim Witness Coordinator

CHERYL A. SEEMAN, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
120 North Henry Street, Room 410
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
1-608-261-5708

(Called to order at 1:08 p.m.)

THE CLERK: Case No. 20-CR-48, the *United States* of *America v. Gerardo Junior Torres*, called for sentencing. May we have the appearances, please?

MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. The United States appears by Elizabeth Altman.

MS. WELSH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Mr. Torres appears by videoconference. I'm his attorney,

Kelly Welsh.

with you, Mr. Torres, to just confirm, based on your written waiver, that it is your desire that we proceed today by videoconference with your sentencing, understanding that you have a right to appear before me in person. Although with the risk of COVID-19, there are good reasons not to do so. Does it continue to be your desire, as reflected in your written waiver, that we proceed on this basis?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then I do also have to confirm with you that you've had an opportunity to read and discuss with your counsel the presentence report, the addendum to that report and the revised presentence report.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: You've had a chance to talk about all 2 those things with your counsel? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: I'm sorry, Ms. Altman, you were going 4 5 to correct something? 6 MS. ALTMAN: I just wanted to let everybody know 7 that it's not streaming and we have victims who are trying to watch. 8 9 THE CLERK: We have had problems logging into the Zoom client with the Zoom app today. And when I tried to 10 launch the streaming service, I got an error message that 11 12 said the meeting is not found or has expired. I'm not 13 sure that that's a problem we can remedy today. 14 MS. ALTMAN: I'm concerned then. I certainly 15 don't want this not to go forward, but we have victims who 16 are trying to watch and who are unable to do so without it 17 being steamed. And I just received a message that 18 they're --19 THE COURT: I appreciate the concern. 20 appreciate your raising it. Is there any chance, 21 Mr. Wiseman, that if we were to all step out and restart 22 this again that it might engage or do you think it's a 23 more profound problem? 24 THE CLERK: I think it's a larger problem. We've 25 had the same problem with each of the judge's separate

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4 accounts and we had to figure out a workaround to start hearing. My suggestion would be for the victims to join the hearing by telephone and I could admit each of them individually. They would just show up as a telephone number on the screen. THE COURT: Would we have the ability for them to appear? THE CLERK: Yes. They'd be able to speak and hear, but we wouldn't see them. THE COURT: Oh, no, I'm sorry. If we wanted them to actually see the video stream, could we admit them into this call? THE CLERK: We certainly could do that, yes. THE COURT: I think I would prefer that. I realize that that make take a few minutes because, Ms. Altman, you'll need to convey to them the stream. that's forwarded -- can she forward hers on, Mr. Wiseman, to the victims to click on or would they need their own admission?

THE CLERK: She could definitely forward the same invitation, same login ID, the same password.

THE COURT: Ms. Altman, do you want to see if we can accomplish that? I don't know how many victims we're talking about.

MS. ALTMAN: Yes. Ms. Erickson, our victim

witness coordinator, is on right now. Eric, is that something you can do right now -- or Andrea? I'm sorry.

MS. ERICKSON: It is something I can do right now. I also have concerns that I believe there are other law enforcement agents and victim witness folks who are online. According to the YouTube stream, there have been up to 11 different people waiting and I certainly can't account for who those other folks would be.

THE COURT: Well, I'm sure the defendant would like to proceed. But I will hear from you, Ms. Altman, as to how you think we should proceed. I don't want to deny access, but I also don't know that -- I suppose the alternative is the one suggested. Should we go with the audio option?

MS. ALTMAN: Well, we still don't know who the other people are. I know two of them are law enforcement. I can send the link to them. Two of them are victim witnesses. My concern is the constitutional nature of having a closed courtroom, that's my concern. The victims we can account for, law enforcement we can account for, the public we can't.

THE COURT: I don't know that the requirement for the public is one that would prevent the hearing from proceeding if we have a technical issue, so I'm inclined to offer -- Andy, can we post the audio option?

1 THE CLERK: By "post," do you mean simultaneously 2 or after the fact? 3 THE COURT: Yes, exactly, and I'm not sure we 4 have a good answer for that. 5 I don't think we can do it THE CLERK: 6 simultaneously. 7 THE COURT: Yeah. Then let's do this: Let's at 8 least -- hopefully we're inviting the victims in at this 9 time and they can participate by videoconference. there's an audio option, how would the officers or law 10 enforcement pursue that? 11 THE CLERK: The invitation contains a link to 12 13 participate fully in the video and audio components. It 14 also contains dial-in telephone numbers that anyone can 15 dial in that would allow them to hear and to speak, but 16 obviously they wouldn't be able to see or be seen. 17 THE COURT: All right. So, Ms. Altman, why don't 18 you offer both options to those you know who are 19 attempting to participate. 20 MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I'll do that right 21 now. 22 And, Ms. Erickson, if you'd be THE COURT: Yes. 23 good enough to also indicate to the victims that if 24 there's anyone else who was planning on participating by 25 YouTube that they have this same option by calling in as

well as by clicking on the video.

MS. ERICKSON: Yes. I'll turn off my --

THE COURT: Sorry. I was just going to ask, as soon as -- I'm not sure how the victims will want to identify themselves, if at all. But Andy will have to invite them in, so it probably would help to have some kind of identification assigned, even if it's just -- I think it was victim -- there was a stipulated victim and charged conduct victim -- stipulated conduct victim and charged conduct victim. Perhaps we could admit them that way.

Ms. Welsh, I haven't turned to you. Any concerns with proceeding on this basis, if we are able to, and relatedly anyone that should be notified from the defendant's family or friends?

MS. WELSH: No, Your Honor, I don't have any concerns proceeding in this manner. We had no one that anticipated logging in, that I'm aware of.

THE COURT: Very good. Mr. Torres, I apologize for the delay, but we certainly want to honor the victim's rights. Not only is that required by statute, it's also important. So we'll wait and hopefully have at least those representing the victim, or victims, participating soon.

In the meantime, we'll go off the record and I'll

await an indication from Ms. Altman or Ms. Erickson if we 1 2 are able to proceed. 3 THE CLERK: Judge, I just got a message from IT. 4 They said they might be able to get the stream going. 5 They're working on it right now. So if we hold for a couple of minutes, we might be able to get this resolved. 6 7 THE COURT: Might get there. Okay. Very good. MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Andy. 8 9 THE COURT: I can see some benefit, I don't know 10 what -- and, Ms. Altman, you may already know -- and we're are off the record at this time. 11 12 (Discussion held off the record.) 13 THE CLERK: Okay. I think that was quick. We 14 are streaming on YouTube, I'm told, so we can begin. 15 THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record. 16 I think, for the benefit of those who are watching us 17 streaming on YouTube, we'll start from the beginning, 18 asking the clerk to call the case. THE CLERK: The United States District Court for 19 2.0 the Western District of Wisconsin is now in session. 21 District Judge William M. Conley presiding. Case No. 22 20-CR-48, the United States of America v. Gerardo Junior 23 Torres, is called for sentencing. May we have the 24 appearances, please? 25 MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

United States appears by Elizabeth Altman.

MS. WELSH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Mr. Torres appears via videoconference and again I'm his attorney, Kelly Welsh.

THE COURT: Thank you both for your appearances.

And, Mr. Torres, I'll just -- we've already got it on the record, but for the benefit of those who were not able to join us immediately, I'll just confirm that you do wish to proceed by this videoconferencing method because of COVID-19 and that you have had an opportunity to both read and discuss the presentence report, the addendum to the report, and the revised presentence report with your counsel. Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor, that's correct.

THE COURT: All right. Then, Ms. Altman, by agreement, I understand you're moving for an additional one-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility --

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- which I will grant. And I'm not sure if you -- my understanding is that there is no specific request for restitution, although there are statutory provisions that I'll need to address. I just want to confirm that as well.

MS. ALTMAN: That is true, Your Honor, no requests.

THE COURT: Okay. With that said then, I'll await any statement on behalf of the victims through your victim coordinator and I'll defer to you whether you wish to do that now or after I address the guidelines.

MS. ALTMAN: We can do that now, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then, Ms. Erickson, I understand, for one of the victims, you're going to be reading a statement.

MS. ERICKSON: Thank you, Your Honor. It's a very quick statement. We've been in contact with the various victims' families in the case and who generally said that they would like a long sentence. The parent of Minor Victim A did ask that we convey directly to you, Judge, that this continues to affect them every day and that they would actually like a life sentence for the defendant.

THE COURT: Understood. And they're aware that there's a statutory cap of 30 years that I can't exceed?

MS. ERICKSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I can certainly understand their reasons for wanting an even higher sentence. And I don't minimize in any way the trauma that can be impacted, something that even the defendant should have better understood, having been a victim of -- apparently a victim of similar abuses as a very young

person.

With that said, I will accept the plea agreement, which contains a stipulation to uncharged criminal conduct, on the basis of my findings that the offense of conviction adequately reflects the defendant's criminal conduct and the plea agreement does not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing.

In determining the defendant's sentence, I will take into consideration the advisory sentencing guidelines and be governed by the statutory purposes of sentencing set forth at Section 3553(a) of Title 18.

As for the guidelines, while neither party filed objections to the presentence report, the defendant did note clarifications and corrections that were incorporated into the revised report. Since these changes have no impact on the guideline calculation, I find the probation office calculated the advisory guideline range correctly using the current manual and taking into account all relevant conduct under Section 1B1.3.

Under Application Note 1, Section 1B1.2, a plea agreement stipulating to the defendant's commission of an additional uncharged criminal offense must be treated as if the defendant had been convicted of that offense as well. In this case the defendant stipulated to committing a second violation under Section 2251(a) of Title 18

involving a 15-year-old minor. Accordingly, the guidelines are applied as if he had been convicted on two counts of production of child pornography.

In addition, under Section 3D1.2, offenses involving a sexual exploitation of minors are specifically excluded from being grouped. Instead, a combined offense level is determined by taking the adjusted level of the highest offense and increasing that level by the appropriate number of units set forth in Section 3D1.4.

Here the guideline for production of child pornography, in violation of Section 2251(a) of Title 18, is found at Section 2G2.1. Under subsection 2.1(a), the base offense level is 32 as to both the count of conviction as well as the stipulated offense.

However, as to the count of conviction, four more levels are added under subsection 2.1(b)(1)(A) because the offense involved a minor who had not yet attained the age of 12 years. Specifically, the defendant recorded sexually explicit video of Minor A, as has been referred to in this record and as cited in the indictment. That minor was at that time approximately seven years of age. In contrast, only two levels are added under subsection 2.1(b)(1)(B) to the stipulated count because the minor victim had, by stipulation, attained the age of 12 years, but not the age of 16 years.

Each count is also assessed two additional levels under subsection 2.1(b)(3) because the defendant knowingly created sex videos and images of both minors which were then distributed to a person identified by the defendant.

Accordingly, the highest adjusted offense level as to the count of conviction is 38 and the adjusted offense level as to the pseudo count is 36. With one unit assessed for each count, the corresponding increase to the combined adjusted offense level is 40.

Moreover, violations of Section 2251(a) of Title 18 are covered sex crimes. Neither Section 4B1.1, as a career offender, nor subsection (a) of Section 4B1.5 applies.

And the defendant engaged in a pattern of activity involving prohibited sexual conduct. Specifically, the defendant sexually assaulted each minor on multiple occasions in 2019 and '20, making him a repeat and dangerous sex offender against minors. Under Section 4B1.5(b)(1), therefore, five more offense levels must be added to the level determined under Chapters Two and Three, increasing the applicable offense level here to 45.

The defendant does qualify for a three-level downward adjustment under Section 3E1.1 because he accepted responsibility by pleading guilty and the government has moved for an additional one-level reduction. This leaves

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
the defendant with a total offense level of 42 and a
criminal history category of I, resulting in an advisory
quideline imprisonment term of 360 months under Section
5G1.1(c).
     Before I hear from counsel and the defendant, I note
that it looks like someone has asked to be admitted. I'm
wondering if, Ms. Erickson, you can identify Ms. Aemus
Balsis.
         MS. ALTMAN:
                     That's an agent, Your Honor, a law
enforcement agent.
         THE COURT: Do you know if they're aware of the
option of viewing on YouTube now that it's been enabled?
         MS. ALTMAN: I don't know if he is or not.
send him an email quick.
         THE COURT: Otherwise we can admit him, but I'll
hold off until hearing from counsel that we've cleared
that up.
         MS. ALTMAN: I sent him an email, Your Honor. I
don't know if it's easier just to let him in. I know he's
not going to speak. Whichever the Court wishes.
         THE COURT: All right. Why don't we just admit
      I'm not sure -- it looks like I have that ability,
him.
Mr. Wiseman, but maybe it's more appropriate if you do it.
         THE CLERK: Very well. I'm admitting him now.
```

THE COURT: And now, Officer Balsis, I understand

that you perhaps didn't get word that the YouTube streaming is now working. And you're welcome to participate or listen in if you would simply mute your mic.

We are continuing. I've just identified the applicable guideline range and we're proceeding to sentencing. For the benefit of all, because the defendant has a total offense level of 42 and a criminal history category of I, he faces an advisory guideline imprisonment range of 360 months under Section 5G1.1(c).

I have the benefit of the defendant's sentencing memorandum recommending the statutory minimum of 15 years and the government's agreed-upon recommendation of 20 years as well as one of the victims requesting a life sentence, notwithstanding the statutory cap of 30 years.

I'm having trouble getting to a minimum sentence here. Frankly, I'm not sure that even 20 years is adequate, given the apparent risk that the defendant represents. But 20 years from now we may have a better understanding of the reason for the defendant's conduct and hopefully a better means of treating that conduct, so I am weighing that in thinking about an appropriate sentence.

With that said, I am interested in anything else that either side wishes to say and of course I do want to hear

from the defendant before deciding on an appropriate sentence. So I'll begin with you, Ms. Altman, for the government.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. The government would submit this is not a case where the 15-year mandatory minimum is warranted, for several reasons. First, as has already been indicated, there are two victims, not just one, which is bad enough, but in this case there's two. And with each victim --

THE COURT: Officer Balsis, if you're going to be on the video, then either put your cap on or leave it off, but it's distracting. And I'm surprised that you would behave in this manner. Thank you.

I apologize, Ms. Altman. If you could go ahead.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. With each victim there is not just, and I mean "just" sort of in quotation marks, one contact. There were numerous contacts. With Minor A, who's the victim in the indictment, there was sexual contact at least nine different times. The minor that we're calling Minor SC, for stipulated conduct, he reported contact at least 15 to 20 times and reported that he woke up to find the defendant having sexual contact with him.

In each of these cases the defendant used goods to try to not only allow for the sexual conduct, but also to

keep them quiet. In one of the videos the defendant can be heard telling Minor A, "I'm going to buy you a lot of toys. Just keep going." And according to Minor SC, the older child, the defendant bought him electronics, gave him cash and threatened that he would take these items away if this child ever reported on him.

Now, the conduct itself is bad enough. It's quite horrific, actually. But then he goes ahead and films it, which amplifies the conduct and allows the abuse to be relived over and over again, and in this case not just by the defendant, but he shared it. He shared it with someone he met on Instagram. So these videos are out there forever. The only good thing is that it appears that you can't see the victim's face in them, most of them, which saves the victims that pain and anxiety, but it's still an aggravating factor.

In addition to the numerous videos found of each of these two children, there were also videos of other child pornography and those are described in the presentence report.

In his interview initially with the police, he denied contact at all with Minor A and then he reported that Minor A did it on his own, which is totally belied by the videos and is also pretty absurd that a seven-year-old would do that.

THE COURT: I was going to say, also irrelevant, but go ahead.

MS. ALTMAN: And with regard to Victim SC, the older child, he blamed most of the contact on the child as opposed to himself and in fact said that the child reported that he was going to rape him, which is just offensive on so many levels.

He also claimed that the phone's camera was turned on without his knowledge, which as we know is just not likely or true and is also belied by the fact that the videos were filed under the kids' names, so he obviously knew what was happening and wanting the results of them.

The final thing the Court should take into consideration is, as the victim's mother reported, this is something that is a struggle for her family every day and that's what we know from the victims of sexual assault and child pornography.

And for those reasons, the public needs protection from this defendant and his contact -- conduct warrants a 20-year sentence. And that's what I'm recommending, is the 20 years.

THE COURT: And for the victims who are listening in, not only do I take note of all of those facts, which were already provided to me in a detailed presentence report, but other aspects of the crimes here and the

likelihood of other conduct by this victim.

I will hear then from defense counsel, understanding that I've had the benefit of your written sentencing memorandum. Anything that you wish to make clear for the record, I'll certainly give you equal leeway.

MS. WELSH: Thank you, Your Honor. To some extent, I am going to repeat briefly the arguments that I made in my sentencing memo because I think they are responsive to the government's arguments. But the first is Mr. Torres did what many people do when they're confronted with their own terrible crimes, which is try to deny involvement and get out of it. Clearly the excuses that he made and the things that he said just were not believable at all and were particularly terrible, especially trying to blame the children.

With time, as I noted in my sentencing memo, he's been able to reflect on just the horrible things that he has done and how reprehensible his crimes are and the damage that he has done to these children. As the Court noted, he suffered from that himself.

We can't dispute the things that the government argues. But again I think it is important for everyone to understand that this is Mr. Torres's first-ever criminal conviction, the first time he has ever been in jail for any crime, and it will be the first time that he will

spend any term of incarceration in a prison, let alone a federal prison.

And the Court -- and a 15-year sentence is not insignificant for a first offense. And as I noted in my memo, it will go a long way to protecting the public, well into Mr. Torres's mid 30s. I did touch on this also in my memo, Your Honor, that --

THE COURT: Just so we're clear, Ms. Welsh, I don't view 15 years as an insignificant sentence. I'm just struggling with the severity of his conduct, repeated conduct, his manipulation of the minors involved and the risk that he presents to the public unless he has a major break-through through therapy, something he hasn't been receptive to to date, but hopefully will be while incarcerated.

MS. WELSH: Yes, Your Honor, and that was the last point I was going to make to address the risks that he would pose to the public. He has never engaged in any meaningful treatment, not even for his significant mental health issues, his depression and anxiety. But we don't have the benefit at this point and he doesn't have the benefit of the intensive sex offender treatment that he is going to undergo both while he's in custody and the after care upon his release.

And hopefully the expectation would be that his

meaningful participation in not only therapy for himself, but sex offender treatment, will encourage him to have these break-throughs and reduce the risks that he has to the public.

Clearly, when he was confronted by law enforcement, he didn't have the benefit of sex offender treatment and knowing exactly and understanding exactly the damage that he caused and he will upon his release from custody here. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Welsh. Then I will turn to you, Mr. Torres, for any comments that you wish to make to the Court before I render sentence.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. Let me start off by saying that I have made -- I know that what I did was wrong. I realize that now, after being incarcerated for the past year, that it's not something that, I don't think, can be forgiven easily. I know I must stop and I own up to it.

I accept responsibility of what went on. I can't change the past. But if I was given the chance to do so, I would. I would have reached out for help with my mental treatment, since I feel as that played a role in what went on. I was in a very dark spot for the past two years and didn't know what to even do with myself throughout the years at some point.

But I just want to apologize, give my sincerest apologies to my victims, and just to have them know that I never -- it was never my intention to induce mental trauma to them the way I did. Thank you.

THE COURT: And what's so hard about that to understand is that you'd experienced it yourself. You've attributed much of your own mental health struggles to what was done to you at the age of nine. And the incredible disconnect that you made to not view what you were doing to minors yourself as causing them damage, it is just really hard to understand, much less accept. It's not to say that there isn't a possibility for you to be treated and perhaps to better understand it and perhaps the pain you inflicted will be motivation to never give in to these dark and ugly acts again.

As far as forgiveness, that's really up to the individual minors who will have to work through this themselves. Hopefully they'll get treatment and process this. There are programs available to them, but it's entirely up to them if they're able to forgive what's happened to them. There are a lot of studies that suggest that kind of forgiveness can be incredibly healing, but that's between the victim and those who care about them, including therapists.

For you, you're going to have to process this in a

way you never have before. And I can only hope that you take seriously the treatments that will be offered to you both during your period of incarceration as well as under federal supervision.

As I say, hopefully we'll learn to better understand why it is people make this choice. The internet has contributed to it. But what we're learning is that it's been going on for a very long time, it's just the internet has given access to those who have been victimized as well as the victimizers. And I can only hope that we all get a better understanding as to why and how this occurs.

I hope you appreciate that the severity of your conduct does require a significant sentence. As you know, you face a minimum of 15 years and a maximum of 30 years. Is there anything else that you wish to add before I render sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. I just want to also add that I know that once I do get the treatment, the help I need, that I will become a better person, I will be a better person, and I will seek out the help that I should have gotten from the beginning. Thank you.

THE COURT: I am prepared to render sentence.

The defendant was raised by his parents in Chicago,

Illinois. While describing his childhood in generally

positive terms and maintaining close relationships in

adulthood with parents, siblings, extended family and childhood friends, the defendant experienced at least one incident of sexual abuse when he was nine years of age in an alley when walking home from school. I suspect that this may be one of other abuse that the defendant will have to confront. But regardless, he believes it was a catalyst for his ongoing struggle with anxiety, depression, panic attacks and suicidal ideations as well as self-medicating with alcohol, marijuana and so-called "club drugs" throughout his teenage years.

Still the defendant reportedly has resisted mental health treatment in the past despite encouragement from his father. He attempts -- or his attempts at suicide are unverified, but his struggles with anxiety and depression are well documented.

Despite the defendant's personal challenges throughout his young life, when his criminal behavior began is unclear. The defendant graduated from high school and was repeatedly able to get good jobs in the years that followed. Throughout his life he has also had supportive family and friends in which to confide. Among the few anomalies in his life before these crimes was his inability to maintain a job for more than a year at a time.

What is clear, from at least late 2019 through April

of 2020, is that the defendant produced, distributed and possessed sexually explicit videos and images of two minor boys, age 15 and 7, that were known to him through friends and acquaintances.

In addition to these images and videos depicting victims known to him, the defendant was in possession of hundreds of other images of sexual acts involving prepubescent males and females. Although claiming he was being blackmailed to do so, the defendant also admitted exchanging sexually explicit content with another individual online.

In addition, the defendant's online presence was vast, consistent with his interest in technology, gaming and social media. He met people online frequently, including his two most recent dating relationships who reside out of state and even out of the country.

During his interviews with investigators, the defendant went so far as to blame the older of two victims, preferring to see himself as helpless or out of control rather than taking ownership of his egregious behavior, something he claims he is willing to do now. The defendant also denied abusing his younger victim more than once. The defendant's perception of his crimes demonstrates that he neither grasps, and perhaps does not still grasp, the severity of his behavior nor the damage

he has caused others.

Despite having no criminal history, the evidence suggests deep-seated, ongoing mental health and sexual issues that will require intensive treatment and personal introspection to address. Moreover, his lack of insight and deviousness make him a substantial danger to minors, as reflected by his purchasing expensive gifts to keep victims from reporting his ongoing abuse.

Taking into consideration the nature of the offense, as well as the defendant's personal history and characteristics, I am persuaded that a lengthy custodial sentence, if somewhat below the guideline, is reasonable and no greater than necessary to hold the defendant accountable, as well as protect the community, provide the defendant the opportunity for rehabilitative programs and achieve parity with the sentences of similarly-situated offenders. This departure is based on Section 5K2.0 as well as the guidance under Section 3553(a)(6) of Title 18.

As to Count 1 of the indictment, therefore, it is adjudged that the defendant is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 240 months. I strongly recommend that the defendant receive mental health and sex offender treatment as well as substance abuse evaluation and recommended treatment, educational and vocational programming. I also recommend that the

defendant be afforded prerelease placement in a residential reentry center with work release privileges.

I did not note a specific request from the defense as to location of placement, but I'll certainly hear if there is any request in that regard.

MS. WELSH: Yes, Your Honor, close to his family in Chicago.

THE COURT: I will certainly make that recommendation, although as counsel is aware, the Bureau of Prisons will ultimately decide placement.

I also note that the defendant is in primary state custody in Taylor County, Wisconsin, Circuit Court Case No. 20CF29. According to the United States Supreme Court's ruling in Setser v. United States, I have the discretion to indicate whether the federal sentence is intended to run consecutively to or concurrently with any sentence that may be imposed in a pending court case. Given that the conduct at issue here appears to be identical to that charge, my sentence will and is to run concurrent with any sentence imposed in that case and will start today.

MS. WELSH: Your Honor, may I address one additional issue as it relates to that?

THE COURT: Yes. I was about to address the time spent. Is that what you were going to raise?

```
1
             MS. WELSH:
                        No.
                              There is a new pending case with
 2
   the stipulated victim. That is Rusk County, Case No.
 3
   21CF23. And so I would also ask that the Court run its
   sentence concurrent to both the Taylor County and Rusk
 4
 5
   County cases.
             THE COURT: And since I've heard from you,
 6
7
   Ms. Altman, I will certainly hear from the government as
 8
   well.
 9
             MS. ALTMAN: I don't have any objection to that,
   Your Honor. It is the same conduct.
10
             THE COURT: All right. Then, Ms. Welsh, if you'd
11
12
   be good enough, for the record, to just indicate again.
13
   It's Rusk County Circuit Court case number what?
14
            MS. WELSH: 21CF23.
15
             THE COURT: All right.
16
            MS. WELSH: Thank you, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: And I wasn't aware of this before
17
18
   this moment. I'll just ask Officer Stieve if you're able
   to confirm that the conduct is consistent with that I've
19
20
   considered today for the federal sentence.
21
             OFFICER STIEVE: Your Honor, I was also not aware
   of this new pending case, so I can't really speak to that.
22
23
             THE COURT:
                       Well, I'm going to accept the
24
   representation of counsel that that's the case, although
25
   it would be a material error if not. I'm not sure what --
```

whether that can be undone once I enter sentence.

Ms. Altman, do you have any reason to be concerned about the representation?

MS. ALTMAN: I don't, Your Honor. I am not aware of any other conduct or any other victims. I have not been made aware of any. And I was told at one point there was going to be charges on the second victim, so it would make sense that it is, but I have not confirmed that either.

MS. WELSH: And I would just note, Your Honor, I did mention the Rusk County case in my sentencing memo which I filed on February 10th, that the case has been pending, has been in the record for a week now.

THE COURT: Yeah. In the future, calling it to the attention of the probation officer would be preferrable if you wanted the treatment you're now asking for. But in fairness, you did note it. It appears to be what it is. And relying on that representation, I will make my sentence concurrent with both cases.

Moreover, if the pending state case or cases are dismissed, the Bureau of Prison may credit any time spent in state custody to this sentence, provided it has not been credited to any other sentence.

The defendant's term of imprisonment is to be followed by a 30-year term of supervised release. In

addition to the statutory mandatory conditions of supervision, in light of the nature of the offense and the defendant's personal history, I adopt Condition Nos. 1 through 24 as proposed and justified in the presentence report, noting that neither party has raised any objections to those proposals.

Under the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, supervision in this case will not only meet the goals of correctional programming and rehabilitation, but assist in deterring further criminal conduct and protecting the public.

Specifically, the defendant recorded himself sexually abusing 15-year-old and 7-year-old boys on multiple occasions. He distributed these video images to an individual online and possessed thousands more images of child pornography. The defendant also provided gifts and material items to his victims so they would not report his crimes.

The defendant further experienced his own abuse at a young age, struggled in school and experimented with drugs at an early age in an apparent attempt to self-medicate mental health symptoms. In need of mental health and substance abuse treatment, the defendant also retained employment for periods time shorter than one year, depending on the emotional and financial support of his family, particularly his parents.

Finally, the instant offense is not drug related and the defendant's history of drug use means that I do not waive drug testing under Section 3583(d) of Title 18, which is addressed in Special Condition No. 17. All of the conditions imposed today will be crucial to ensuring the defendant's transition back into society and protecting the public.

As counsel is aware, despite my findings, there is at least some question as to whether I should enter each of the conditions on the record verbatim as well as justify them individually, and I am certainly willing to do so unless the defense wishes to waive my doing it.

MS. WELSH: We do waive, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If, when the defendant is released from confinement to begin his term of supervised release, either he or the supervising probation officer believes any of the conditions imposed today are no longer appropriate, they may certainly petition the Court for a review and modification.

I just urge the defendant to play straight with the supervising officer and reach agreement on supervision.

If it becomes apparent that the defendant is engaged in any deviousness or failure of candor, it would be grounds to revoke his supervision.

It is adjudged the defendant is to pay a \$100

criminal assessment penalty to the Clerk of Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, which is required by statute and immediately due following sentencing. I encourage the defendant to pay that assessment as agreed in the plea agreement, if at all possible, to avoid preclusion from programming while in the federal prison system for nonpayment, although checking off a small reduction each month from any earnings while imprisoned will hopefully cause the same impact.

The victim in this case has not made a specific request for restitution. However, as noted in the plea agreement, the defendant did agree to pay restitution. Pursuant to the Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2018, which applies to offenses that occurred after November 7, 2018, if the defendant's conviction is for trafficking in child pornography, as here, the Court shall order restitution under Section 2259(b)(2) of Title 18 in an amount that reflects the defendant's relevant role in the causal process that underlies the victim's losses, but which is no less than \$3,000.

Subject to limitations, a victim of "trafficking in child pornography" offense may elect to receive a one-time \$35,000 (indexed for inflation) defined monetary assistance payment from the Child Pornography Victims

Reserve established under Section 1402(d)(6) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984. And for the victims who are participating, I'm certain that the United States Attorney's victim coordinator would assist you in petitioning for compensation. I do impose a restitution order of \$3,000 as to each victim under that Act, but, because the defendant is indigent, waive any assessment that could be imposed under the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015.

I also find that the defendant does not have the economic resources to allow himself to make full payment of the restitution order in the foreseeable future under any reasonable schedule of payments. And, therefore, he's to be making nominal payments of a minimum of a hundred dollars each month under Section 3664(f)(3)(B) of Title 18 beginning within 30 days from his release from custody. No interest shall accrue on this principal amount.

The defendant shall notify the Court and the United States Attorney General of any material change in the defendant's economic circumstances that might affect his ability to pay restitution.

The defendant also lacks the means to pay a further fine under Section 5E1.2(c) without impairing his ability to support himself upon release from custody and so I impose no further fine.

A final order of forfeiture is granted for the property seized from the defendant, as reflected in the forfeiture order, in accordance with Section 2253 of Title 18 of the United States Code.

The U.S. Probation Office is to notify local law enforcement agencies and the state attorney general of the defendant's release back into the community.

At this time I'll simply ask the defense whether or not I have sufficiently addressed the defendant's main arguments in mitigation.

MS. WELSH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I'll ask the government if you wish to move for dismissal of the remaining count.

MS. ALTMAN: I do, Your Honor. And if I may have one minute to address restitution as well.

THE COURT: You may. I will grant the motion as to Count 2 and I'll hear you as to restitution.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. It's my understanding of the new restitution statute -- I guess it's not that new anymore -- that notwithstanding the \$3,000 mandatory nature of it, there still has to be a request by the victims to trigger the \$3,000 payment. At this point we don't have that.

If we could have 30 days just to verify that they're not going to make the request, that would be appreciated.

The guidance that we've gotten is that without a request, that fund has not yet been set up and that it's not triggered.

THE COURT: All right. Then I will give you 30 days to indicate whether you wish it to be -- restitution to be entered, \$3,000 per victim.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: And if I don't hear from you within 30 days, then that will not be imposed.

MS. ALTMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Is that acceptable to the defense as well?

MS. WELSH: Your Honor, I do object to a 30-day continuance. I'm confident that the victim witness coordinator had discussed this with the victims and they did not make a request before sentencing today. I object for purely legal purposes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. I was going to say, I would often set aside a restitution hearing after entering sentence. And the fact that they may not have asked for it before the date of sentencing has never been a requirement in this Court and it's not one now. If there's any concern as to their waiver, I think a 30-day notice period is appropriate and so I do leave that open for 30 days.

My final obligation, Mr. Torres, is to advise you of your right to appeal this Court's sentence. I did not arrive at it lightly. I truly hope and pray that you're able to find the insight necessary to not be a risk to others upon release, but I just was not confident of that. As I say, there may be advances made that will make it more likely, but it really comes down to you.

If you are sincere in your desire to address your conduct, you'll have a chance to do that within the treatment programs in the federal prison and to continue it under close supervision upon release, and I only hope that that's what you accomplish.

But you have a right to appeal my sentence. You only have 14 days to file a notice of appeal. And I'm confident that Ms. Welsh would assist you in filing a notice of appeal, so you should discuss the filing and possible grounds with her as soon as possible. Someone else may be appointed to represent you on appeal.

With that said, I'll hear if there's anything more for the government at this time.

MS. ALTMAN: Nothing, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything more for the defense?

MS. WELSH: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Good luck, Mr. Torres. And for the victims, I hope you are able to get treatment and to find

1 some measure of healing with respect to the egregious 2 injury caused. We are adjourned. 3 (Adjourned at 2:10 p.m.) 4 5 I, CHERYL A. SEEMAN, Certified Realtime and Merit 6 Reporter, in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that 7 the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the 8 proceedings held on the 17th day of February, 2021, before 9 the Honorable William M. Conley, of the Western District 10 of Wisconsin, in my presence and reduced to writing in accordance with my stenographic notes made at said time 11 12 and place. 13 Dated this 4th day of March, 2021. 14 15 16 /s/ 17 Cheryl A. Seeman, RMR, CRR Federal Court Reporter 18 19 20 21 22 The foregoing certification of this transcript does not 23 apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the 24 certifying reporter.

25